

**COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS IN
THREE RUBBER GLOVE MANUFACTURING PLANTS**

LOH LEE KUAN

**Dissertation submitted to University of Malaya for partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Technology (Environmental Management)
(One Semester Mini Dissertation after Two Semesters of Course Work)**

**Institute of Postgraduate Studies
University of Malaya
50603 Kuala Lumpur**

NOVEMBER 2001

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A510232885

OK

ABSTRACT

During the manufacturing of rubber gloves, water is used as wash water at different stages to clean the rubber gloves, thus generating quite a substantial amount of effluent. There are four main sources of effluent, i.e. a) from the glove formers cleaning tank, which collects the acidified water used to clean these formers, b) latex dipping tank, where it collects wash water used to cool the tank during dipping process and the sludge from the tank itself, c) leaching tank, where it collects wash water used to leach out the pollutants from the gloves and lastly d) latex compounding, containing the washing water from ball mill, latex containers, uncoagulated latex and sludge. Often, these effluents contain high concentration of pollutants particularly the organic matters, which well exceeded the limit of the discharge standard under the Third Schedule of the Environmental Quality Regulations (Sewage and Industrial Effluents) 1979. Thus, it is extremely critical to treat these effluents to reduce the level of pollutants to within the permissible standards before being discharged into the rivers or receiving waters.

A comparative study on the performance of effluent treatment plants (WWTPs) from three rubber glove manufacturing factories was carried out. These factories, Factory A, B and C, have adopted similar design system for their WWTPs. The design system basically involved chemical-flocculation with dissolved air flotation (DAF) as the primary treatment, followed by activated sludge process (extended aeration) as the secondary treatment. While the design systems were alike, the sizes of these WWTPs were different. The WWTP for Factory A had a capacity to handle effluent volume of 166 m³/d, while Factory B was designed to handle 1000 m³/d of effluent.

Factory C was designed to cater approximately 1200 m³/d of effluent generated from its production lines.

Three main parameters were selected for this study, namely Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) and Suspended Solids (SS). These three parameters measured the presence of organic matters and solid matters which contributed to the pollution of the effluent. The performance of the WWTP for the selected factories was ascertained based on its capability in reducing the levels of these three parameters from two aspects, i.e. the overall reduction and reduction at different stages of effluent treatments.

The study revealed that the characteristics of raw rubber glove manufacturing effluent from Factory A, B and C were quite similar and consistent. BOD concentration in rubber glove effluent for these factories ranged from 85 mg/l to 1035 mg/l, while SS concentration ranged from 32 mg/l to 1305 mg/l. The COD concentration obtained was within 300 mg/l and 4360 mg/l.

Overall the performances for the WWTPs for the three selected factories were found to be acceptable. The BOD, COD and SS concentrations were successfully reduced to the permissible limit of the DOE regulatory standards and could be discharged into the rivers and public drain safely. It was also found that the chemical-flocculation with DAF reduced substantial concentrations for the BOD, COD and SS. Hence, the effluent treatment was mainly by the physico-chemical treatment. However, the biological treatment was important to help to further reduce the pollutants to the allowable discharge limits. Thus, this design system involving the combination of

chemical-flocculation with DAF, followed by an extended aeration treatment has proven to be effective and suitable in treating the effluent from rubber glove manufacturing industries.

The WWTP for Factory A displayed the highest efficiency in the overall percentage reduction of BOD, COD and SS as compared to Factory B and C. Similarly, for the primary treatment and secondary treatment respectively, Factory A had recorded highest percentage reduction for the three parameters. From the findings, the actual loading for the three parameters as compared to the design loading for these factories, was not 100% accurate, and thus could not be concluded that the performance of a WWTP decreased with the increased size of the plant. It was also not possible to establish a trend in the removal of BOD, COD and SS among these factories, due to lack of information on the actual manufacturing processes involved in these factories.

In loving memory of my beloved Dad.....

"I should have never procrastinated".

Lee Kuan / November 2001.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most heartfelt thanks to my project supervisor, Prof. Dr. P. Agamuthu for all his guidance, assistance and unyielding effort particularly on the last stage of my thesis preparation.

Special thanks to my company, Mssr. Chemical Waste Management Sdn Bhd., for their support, understanding and allowing me to shorten my working hours to enable me to attend my lectures.

My sincere thanks goes to Dr. Zaid Isa, who has provide me his published articles and reference which were extremely useful in my project.

I thank Malaysian Rubber Glove Manufacturers' Association for allowing me to use its library for my research in the rubber glove industry.

Most important of all, my deepest gratitude to my family members for all the support, patience, encouragement and understanding they have showered onto me throughout these five years. My greatest regret is that my dad is no longer around to share my joy.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
 CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Generation of Rubber Effluent during the Processes	3
1.3 Regulatory Standards	6
1.4 Treatment of Effluent	7
1.5 Performance Studies on Rubber Glove Manufacturing Plants	11
1.6 Objectives of this Study	12
 CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW	 13
2.1 Rubber Product Manufacturing Industries	13
2.1.1 Background of Rubber Product Manufacturing Industries	13
2.1.2 Types of Rubber Products	14
2.2 Rubber Glove Manufacturing – Processes Involved	20
2.2.1 Definition of Latex	20
2.2.2 Manufacturing Process	22
2.3 Generation of Effluent and its Characteristics	24
2.3.1 Generation of Effluent	24

2.3.2	Characteristics of Effluent	26
2.4	Types of Effluent Treatment	29
2.4.1	Treatment Technology	29
2.4.2	Primary Treatment	30
2.4.2.1	Chemical Coagulation	30
2.4.2.2	Flocculation	32
2.4.2.3	Primary Sedimentation	35
2.4.2.4	Flotation	39
2.4.3	Secondary Treatment	47
2.4.3.1	General	47
2.4.3.2	Aerobic Processes	49
2.5	Treatment of Effluent from Rubber Glove Manufacturing Industries	62
2.5.1	Flocculation-Activated Sludge System	65
2.5.2	Flocculation, Anaerobic Digestion and Aerated Lagoon System	67
2.5.3	Flocculation-Aerated Lagoon System	69
2.5.4	Flocculation-DAF-Activated Sludge System	69
CHAPTER THREE : MATERIALS AND METHODS		71
3.1	Wastewater Samples	71
3.2	Chemical Analyses	74
3.2.1	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	74
3.2.2	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	75
3.2.3	Suspended Solids (SS)	77

CHAPTER FOUR :	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	79
4.1	Characteristics of Rubber Gloves Manufacturing Industry Wastewater	79
4.2	Treatment of Effluent	84
4.2.1	General	84
4.2.2	Pre-treatment and Equalisation	85
4.2.3	Chemical Treatment	88
4.2.4	Primary Sedimentation	89
4.2.5	Biological Treatment	90
4.2.6	Secondary Sedimentation	90
4.2.7	Sludge Thickening and Disposal	92
4.3	Removal of BOD from Rubber Glove Manufacturing Industries Effluent	93
4.3.1	Removal of BOD from Factory A Effluent	94
4.3.2	Removal of BOD from Factory B Effluent	97
4.3.3	Removal of BOD from Factory C Effluent	99
4.4	Removal of COD from Rubber Glove Manufacturing Industries	102
4.4.1	Removal of COD from Factory A Effluent	103
4.4.2	Removal of COD from Factory B Effluent	106
4.4.3	Removal of COD from Factory C Effluent	108
4.5	Removal of SS from Rubber Glove Manufacturing Industries	109
4.5.1	Removal of SS from Factory A Effluent	111
4.5.2	Removal of SS from Factory B Effluent	114
4.5.3	Removal of SS from Factory C Effluent	115
4.6	Comparative Performance of WWTPs for Factory A, B and C	119

4.6.1	Removal Efficiency of BOD	121
4.6.2	Removal Efficiency of COD	123
4.6.3	Removal Efficiency of SS	126
CHAPTER FIVE :	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	129
REFERENCES		132
APPENDICES		141
Appendix I	Environmental Quality Regulations (Sewage and Industrial Effluents), 1979.	141
Appendix II	Photos of WWTP at different Stages of Treatment (Plate 1 to 6)	142

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1 Generation of effluent from the Examination Glove Manufacturing Industry at different location of the process.
- Figure 1.2 Typical process diagram for rubber industry effluent treatment system.
- Figure 2.1 Latex Compounding Process
- Figure 2.2 A schematic representation of the resulting colloidal state (Guoy-Stern Colloidal Model).
- Figure 2.3 Mechanisms of coagulation.
- Figure 2.4 Typical Rectangular Sedimentation Tanks – (a) Chain-and-flight collector and (b) Travelling-bridge Collector.
- Figure 2.5 A typical Circular Primary Sedimentation Tank.
- Figure 2.6 Circular Upward Radial Flow DAF.
- Figure 2.7 Horizontal Tank Type DAF (a) without recycle, and (b) with recycle.
- Figure 2.8 Tilted Plate Flotation DAF.
- Figure 2.9 The Aerobic Cycle in nature.
- Figure 2.10 The Anaerobic Cycle in nature.
- Figure 2.11 Activated Sludge process.
- Figure 2.12 Schematic diagrams of Activated Sludge Systems with different modifications.
- Figure 2.13 Schematic diagrams of Aerated Lagoon Systems.
- Figure 2.14 Typical schematic diagram of the Flocculation and Activated Sludge System.

- Figure 3.1 Map of Peninsular Malaysia indicating the location of Factory A, B and C.
- Figure 3.2 Schematic flow diagram of the WWTP indicating the effluent sampling points.
- Figure 4.1 Process flow diagram of a WWTP.
- Figure 4.2 BOD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.3 Percentage BOD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.4 BOD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.
- Figure 4.5 Percentage BOD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.
- Figure 4.6 BOD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.7 Percentage BOD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.8 COD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.9 Percentage COD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.10 COD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.
- Figure 4.11 Percentage COD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.

- Figure 4.12 COD concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.13 Percentage COD removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.14 SS Concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.15 Percentage SS removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory A.
- Figure 4.16 SS Concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.
- Figure 4.17 Percentage SS removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory B.
- Figure 4.18 SS Concentration at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.19 Percentage SS removal efficiency at different stages of effluent treatment at Factory C.
- Figure 4.20 A comparison of BOD removal efficiency at different stages for effluent treatment at Factory A, B and C.
- Figure 4.21 A comparison of COD removal efficiency at different stages for effluent treatment at Factory A, B and C.
- Figure 4.22 A comparison of SS removal efficiency at different stages for effluent treatment at Factory A, B and C.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	The current and future structure of rubber product group cluster.
Table 2.2	Export of rubber product by product group, 1994-2000.
Table 2.3	Exports of latex goods from Malaysia, 2000
Table 2.4	The natural rubber consumption in five main categories of rubber product, by product sector in Malaysia in 1998.
Table 2.5	Characteristics of untreated effluents from latex-based industries
Table 2.6	Characteristic of untreated effluent from Examination Glove Manufacturing Factories.
Table 2.7	Types of effluent treatment system adopted by the latex-based industry.
Table 2.8	The use of DAF in WWTPs for various industries.
Table 2.9	Comparison of chemical pre-treatment methods for a Poultry Slaughterhouse Effluent, with different types of chemical prior to DAF.
Table 2.10	Effluent treatment plant performance for a Condom Manufacturing Plant (Case Study).
Table 2.11	Major biological treatment processes used for wastewater treatment.
Table 2.12	Summary of average parameter and BOD removal Efficiency for aerobic and facultative ponds.

Table 2.13	Treatment of wastewater from Rubber Products Manufacturing Industry in Malaysia.
Table 2.14	Types of wastewater treatment systems adopted by the Rubber Products Manufacturing Industry in Malaysia.
Table 2.15	Status of compliance of latex-based industry with the effluent discharge standards
Table 2.16	Performance of Activated Sludge System in the treatment of Examination Glove Manufacturing WWTP.
Table 4.1	Characteristics of effluent from Rubber Glove Manufacturing Factories.
Table 4.2	Monthly Average BOD concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory A.
Table 4.3	Monthly Average BOD Concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory B.
Table 4.4	Monthly Average BOD concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory C.
Table 4.5	Monthly Average COD Concentration at Different Stages of Effluent Treatments for Factory A.
Table 4.6	Monthly Average COD concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory B.
Table 4.7	Monthly Average COD concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory C.
Table 4.8	Monthly Average SS concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory A.

Table 4.9	Monthly Average SS concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory B.
Table 4.10	Monthly average SS concentration at different stages of effluent treatments for Factory C.
Table 4.11	Summary of BOD, COD and SS concentrations (average values) for Factory A, B and C.
Table 4.12	Summary of percentage removal efficiency of BOD, COD and SS (average value) for Factory A, B and C.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
CAF	Cavitation Air Flotation
CDC	Center for Disease Control and Prevention
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
d	day
DAF	Dissolved Air Flotation
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
DOE	Department of Environment
DS	Dissolved Solids
F/M	Food to Microorganism Ration
g	gramme
H ₂ O	Water
H ₂ S	Hydrogen Sulphide
HRT	Hydraulic Retention Time
IRG / GRG	Industrial and General Rubber Goods
kg	kilogramme
kPa	kilopascal
l	liter
LTC	Latex Timber Clone
m ³	cubic meter
m ³ /d	cubic meter per day
MARGMA	Malaysian Rubber Gloves Manufacturers' Association
mg	milligramme

mm	millimeter
N ₂ or N	Nitrogen (gas)
nm	nanometer
NR	natural rubber
O & G	Oil and Grease
O ₂	Oxygen
P	Phosphorus
PAC	powdered activated carbon
ppm	Parts Per Million
RAS	Return Activated Sludge
RRIM	Rubber Research Institute of Malaysian
RSS	Ribbed Smoke Rubber
SET	Settleable Solids
SMR	Standard Malaysian Rubber
SR	Synthetic Rubber
SRT	Sludge Retention Time
SS	Suspended Solids
TPF	Tilted Plate Flotator
TS	Total Solids
UD	Undetected
USAB	Upflow Anaerobic Sludge Blanket
WAS	Waste Activated Sludge
WWT	Wastewater Treatment
WWTPs	Wastewater Treatment Plants
Zn	Zinc